

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 23, 2003. Claim 22-27 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 22 has been amended to cure such indefiniteness.

Claims 22-27 stand rejected in view of the combination of *Hudetz et al.* and *Ogasawara*. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The Examiner is utilizing the *Hudetz* reference for the purpose of indicating that the unique input ID is associated with a message packet. Applicant disagrees with this assertion on the part of the Examiner. First, the Examiner is reading the computer with the input device, as providing a computer that will provide an input device having an input ID. Applicant notes that a Network Interface Card (NIC) does, in fact, have a unique ID. However, this unique ID is only useful in the local area network. If this computer is connected to a remote location over a global communication network, this unique ID no longer is sent to the remote location and is thus not "associated" with the unique value. In such a remote connection, however, there must be some type of IP address associated with the computer. This is done through the use of a router. In a router, a dynamic address is associated with a particular computer when it is turned on. That router will assign the address to that particular computer. When the computer sends a message back through the router, then this dynamic address will be modified at the router and at various locations along the network. The purpose of this is to insure that a return packet can be transferred back to that computer. However, this dynamic address is not unique to that particular computer or scanning device. Further, Applicant notes that the unique ID is only unique to the scanning device *when it is attached to the computer*. As such, the dynamic ID is temporarily unique

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

S/N 09/494,924

Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-24,913

to the computer and not to the scanner unless this computer had an integral scanner associated therewith. There is no disclosure in *Hudetz* that shows that the ID is unique to anything but the computer for a Network Interface Card and there is no disclosure set forth that anything other than the dynamic IP address is utilized, which is neither unique to the computer nor to the scanner. Therefore, Applicant believes that it is incorrect to read the computer as having the unique ID as set forth in the claims which require that the unique ID be associated uniquely with the input device. This is for the reason that a manufacturer can send the device out, and, when the device is used, recognize that unique ID for the purpose of routing certain information thereto.

The Examiner has also used the *Ogasawara* reference to support the concept of the input device ID being permanently associated with the input device independent of the first location. Applicant disagrees that the *Ogasawara* device discloses such. This patent sets forth that a purchaser will dial the telephone number of a store server, upon connection, the telephone interface will obtain the customer's phone number and then search the customer's information database in the store server. However, there is no unique association of the telephone number with a particular input device. This phone number is only associated with the port. This is distinctly different from the Examiner's note that a particular device such as a computer will have a unique network address. There is no device set forth that has a unique address in the *Ogasawara* reference; rather, all that is disclosed is the use of the caller ID function and this is performed at the switch and has no relationship to what phone is plugged in. In fact, a customer can plug any phone into the socket and the server at the other end will always recognize that it is that customer, the server assuming that the information being transmitted is from the particular location to which the phone line is connected. However, this is a function of the phone company and not in any way related to the device itself. As such, Applicant believes that the *Ogasawara* reference does not provide association of a unique ID with a particular device, which is then transmitted to a remote location for use therein.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection, as Applicant believes that *Hudetz* and *Ogasawara*, taken singularly or in combination, do not anticipate Applicant's present inventive concept as defined by the amending claims.

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

S/N 09/494,924

Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-24,913

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-24,913 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants

Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/yoc

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
May 13, 2004

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**  
S/N 09/494,924  
Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-24,913